

# Summary of Municipal and Township Responses to Proposal for Conversion of Hamilton County's Regional Planning Commission to a County Planning Commission

---

## Summary of Comments from Jurisdictions Approving Resolutions Requesting Conversion:

1. City of Sharonville
  - The county planning commission structure eliminates current inequities in local jurisdiction fees for membership.
2. Village of Evendale
  - Evendale sees the conversion as primarily a name change and will not result in any substantive changes. Therefore, Evendale supports the conversion if desired by the County Commissioners.
  - The county planning commission structure eliminates current inequities in local jurisdiction fees for membership.
3. City of Montgomery
  - Montgomery supports the conversion if desired by the Regional Planning Commission. The RPC resolution indicated support for the conversion.
  - The county planning commission structure is desirable since it eliminates municipal fees. Montgomery now pays a voluntary annual fee of \$3300 to be a member of HCRPC but the majority of jurisdictions don't pay the fee. Also, Montgomery does not request or receive many services from HCRPC; however, townships receive a high level of service but most elect not to pay the annual fee. Therefore the membership fees are inequitable in the regional planning commission structure.
4. City of Milford
  - Milford is mostly in Clermont County and their county planning commission seems to work satisfactorily.
  - The conversion would have no impact on Milford.
  - The county planning commission structure eliminates current inequities in local jurisdiction fees for membership.
5. North College Hill
  - The county planning commission structure eliminates current inequities in local jurisdiction fees for membership.
6. City of Wyoming
  - The county planning commission structure eliminates the inequitable fee structure of the regional planning commission.
  - Some communities can't afford to pay the current RPC fee, but need RPC services
7. Springfield Township (not authorized to vote)
  - The county planning commission structure eliminates current inequities in local jurisdiction fees for membership.

**Summary of Comments from Other Jurisdictions:** (concerns expressed in resolutions, letters, and emails)

1. City of Springdale (HCRPC Member)
  - May result in political appointments
  - Increases BOCC authority over the planning commission and may decrease municipal voice
  - No assurance of a municipal representation if all are appointed by BOCC
  - Larger commission of 11 members is less efficient
  - Less assurance of diversity in geography, municipalities, etc.
2. Village of Fairfax (HCRPC Member)
  - Feel that the current representation is more beneficial to villages and townships
  - Request that the HCRPC continue to function in the professional and comprehensive manner that it has done for the past 75 years
3. City of Madeira
  - Working fine as is
  - Concerned about political influence if converted to a county planning commission with all appointments made by county commissioners
4. City of Forest Park
  - New form would be more political; this could be the first step for this County Commission to take over more control of the local planning commissions.
  - The regional structure of the planning commission could be improved by including Butler and Warren Counties.
5. City of Cincinnati
  - Not in favor of supporting any action that would take away existing power of the city. Currently as a regional planning commission Cincinnati is authorized to appoint one HCRPC member. Under the county planning commission structure Cincinnati would only be authorized to nominate a member and the county commissioners would have the authority to appoint.
6. Miami Township
  - Re-organization appears to be designed to provide a centralization of organization so that the Board of County Commissioners may exert greater control and direction over the operation of the county form of Planning Commission without any assurance of improved services to the political subdivisions of Hamilton County.
  - The township is reasonably satisfied with the current organization and service.
7. Columbia Township
  - Primary concerns are the reduction of township representation on the proposed structure and the centralization of the Commission without assurances of improved services to the political jurisdictions of the county.
  - The township is satisfied with the current organization and service.

## 8. Symmes Township

- The proposed reorganization appears to be designed to provide a centralization of organization so that the Board of County Commissioners may exert greater control and direction over the operation of the county form of Planning Commission without any assurance of improved services to the political subdivisions of Hamilton County.
- The township is reasonably satisfied with the current organization and service.

## 9. Colerain Township

- The proposed reorganization appears to be designed to provide a centralization of organization so that the Board of County Commissioners may exert greater control and direction over the operation of the planning commission without any assurance of improved services to the political subdivisions of Hamilton County.

## 10. Harrison Township

- The conversion would place control of all planning decisions in the unincorporated territory of Hamilton County under the County Commissioners
- The largest undeveloped territory in Hamilton County is located in the three townships west of the Great Miami River (Crosby, Harrison and Whitewater Townships) and the proposed appointments to the Planning Commission do not assure representation from the largest undeveloped territory in Hamilton County.
- The structure of the proposed Planning Commission is statutorily unfair in that there should be no representation of County Commissioners on the Planning Commission since the Commissioners on the Planning Commission have the final vote on any re-zoning issue before its adoption
- The current HCRPC structure has generally worked satisfactorily for 75 years without having a direct reporting relationship to the County Commissioners
- One of the departments of County government over which the County Commissioners already have control of appointments is totally out of touch with the requirements contained in the zoning resolution and out of touch with the goals and desires of the local communities and consistently grants exceptions to the zoning code which are contrary to the desires of the local government.
- The Township wants less control from the central government, not more, in that, some of the departments under the control of the Commissioners are inept and insensitive to local government goals and needs.

## 11. Green Township

- The proposed reorganization appears to be designed to provide a centralization of organization so that the Board of County Commissioners may exert greater control and direction over the operation of the planning commission without any assurance of improved services to the political subdivisions of Hamilton County.
- The township is satisfied with the current organization and service.

<b>2006 Paid Members – HCRPC</b> (shown in Boldface Type)		<b>Municipal Planning Commissions</b>		<b>Township Trustees</b>	
(Authorized to vote on dissolution of HCRPC)		(Authorized to vote on creation of a County Planning Commission)		(Not requested or authorized to vote; but expressing an opinion)	
<b>Dissolve Regional PC?</b>		<b>Create County PC?</b>		<b>Create County PC?</b>	
<i>Supported by 5 of 22 members</i>		<i>Supported by 6 of 37 municipalities</i>		<i>Supported by 1 of 12 townships</i>	
		note: petitions from 19 municipalities are required for conversion			
1. <b>Anderson Twp</b>		1. Addyston		1. Miami Twp	—
2. <b>Columbia Twp</b>	—	2. Amberley Village		2. Harrison Twp	—
3. <b>Springfield Twp</b>	Yes	3. Arlington Heights		3. Colerain Twp	—
4. <b>Symmes Twp</b>	—	4. Blue Ash		4. Green Twp	—
		5. Cheviot		5. Delhi Twp	
5. <b>Cincinnati</b>	—	6. <b>Cincinnati</b>	—	6. Crosby Twp	
6. <b>Cleves</b>		7. <b>Cleves</b>		7. Whitewater T.	
7. <b>Deer Park</b>		8. <b>Deer Park</b>		8. Sycamore Twp	
8. <b>Evendale</b>	Yes	9. <b>Elmwood Place</b>		9. <b>Anderson</b>	
9. <b>Fairfax</b>	—	10. <b>Evendale</b>	Yes	10. <b>Columbia</b>	—
10. <b>Forest Park</b>	—	11. <b>Fairfax</b>	—	11. <b>Springfield</b>	Yes
11. <b>Glendale</b>		12. <b>Forest Park</b>	—	12. <b>Symmes</b>	—
12. <b>Greenhills</b>		13. <b>Glendale</b>			
13. <b>Loveland</b>		14. Golf Manor			
14. <b>Mariemont</b>		15. <b>Greenhills</b>			
15. <b>Milford</b>	Yes	16. Harrison			
16. <b>Montgomery</b>	Yes	17. <b>Indian Hill</b>			
17. <b>Silverton</b>		18. Lincoln Heights			
18. <b>Springdale</b>	—	19. Lockland			
19. <b>Indian Hill</b>		20. <b>Loveland</b>			
20. <b>Wyoming</b>	Yes	21. Madeira	—		
21. <b>Reading</b>		22. <b>Mariemont</b>			
22. <b>Elmwood Place</b>		23. <b>Milford</b>	Yes		
		24. <b>Montgomery</b>	Yes		
		25. Mt. Healthy			
		26. Newtown			
		27. North Bend			
		28. N. College Hill	Yes		
		29. Norwood			
		30. Reading			
		31. Sharonville	Yes		
		32. <b>Silverton</b>			
		33. <b>Springdale</b>	—		
		34. St. Bernard			
		35. Terrace Park			
		36. Woodlawn			
		37. <b>Wyoming</b>	Yes		

— = Opposition to conversion stated by resolution, letters, or emails